

## **REMARKS**

In the March 3, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the abstract. The Examiner objected to claim 6 and rejected claim 27 for non-enablement. The Examiner further rejected claims 12-13, 24-28 and 42 for indefiniteness. The Examiner rejected claims 24-25, 28-30 and 28 as anticipated by Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,470). The Examiner rejected claims 39-41 and 43-45 as anticipated by Wehrenberg (WO 97/44736) and claims 1-6, 8, 12 and 18 as anticipated by Brunts (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,269). The Examiner rejected the remaining claims as obvious.

Applicant has amended the abstract to provide antecedent basis for the term device identifier ID.

Applicant has amended claim 6 to correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner. Applicant has amended claims 12-13 to refer to claim 8 in order to supply proper antecedent basis for the “device identifier (ID)” term. Applicant has amended claim 24 to make reference to a “generated identifier” thus providing definiteness to dependent claims 25-38. Applicant has further amended claim 24 to supply antecedent basis to “the computer system,” “the second scrambled code” and “the calculated identifier” The Examiner has objected to the term “enabled” in claim 24, however, the specification uses the term “enabled” to define the file being ready for use. (see p. 12, lns. 31-34). The Examiner has objected to claim 25 based on the terms “the device identifier” and “the changed identifier,” however such terms do not appear in claim 25 but appear in claim 27. Applicant has amended claim 27 to eliminate the erroneously asserted “read-only” limitation to the memory and provide antecedent basis for the above mentioned terms. Applicant has amended claim 27 to eliminate the term “newly.” Applicant has amended claim 28 to better define “the hierarchical file structure.” Applicant has amended claim 29 to provide antecedent basis for “the access authorization identifier” by replacing it with the proper

term. Applicant has amended claim 31 to reference claim 28 to provide antecedent basis for “the hierarchical file structure and has provided antecedent basis for “the position” and “the vector.” Applicant has amended claims 33-34 to give proper reference to the “device identification number.” Claim 34 has been amended to eliminate the term “it.” Applicant has amended claims 36-37 to properly identify the now “selected group of files” referenced in amended claim 24. Applicant has amended claim 38 to provide antecedent basis for “the use right.” Applicant has amended claim 42 to provide antecedent basis for “the vector AC(x)” and the “m components” The Examiner has objected to the term “allocated” in Claim 31 and 42, however Applicant respectfully submits that “allocates” is well understood to one of ordinary skill in the art and this term has support in the specification at p. 5, lines 6-18. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments are sufficient to overcome the present objections.

The present invention is directed toward a method and system for enabling the use of selected files from a storage medium for applications such as navigation data access in a vehicle. The invention specifies a navigation or multimedia system in which a check is carried out to determine whether a user of files, such as roadmap data, is authorized to use a selected number of the files such as navigation maps relating to a certain region from a larger, complete collection of map files which may cover an entire country. The system checks authorized use of each file on the bulk storage medium on which the files are stored. The files are stored in encrypted form. The user enters a first and a second scrambled code (PIN and ACW) into the navigation system. These codes are converted into vectors. A device identifier ID of the navigation system and the first scrambled code PIN are first used to calculate a key,  $k$ . The key,  $k$ , and the second scrambled code, ACW, are used to calculate an access authorization identifier, AC, which is compared with the access authorization identifiers for the files stored on the storage medium. If

these identifiers match, the associated file or files are decrypted and enabled for use by the navigation system.

In contrast, the Cooper reference does not relate to navigational data for a motor vehicle. Cooper relates to making a temporary key to access a file, but does not disclose a key which may be used to access two or more files from a collection of files in addition to using a key for the storage medium itself. The Cooper system would involve using multiple keys if a user wished to access multiple files, a cumbersome process, if a user would require use of multiple files.

Brunts relates to a GPS navigation system which uses a data identification code on a data card which has various destinations stored. The card identification must match an identification code related to the reader in order to allow the reader to function. However, these codes would be simple to replicate because they do not depend on a code for the storage medium and a code for the specific file. Further, the Brunts system does not allow selective access to different files on a storage medium and is not a user entered identification code. Brunts also does not disclose map data, it is characterized as a mapless navigation system (Col. 5, Ins. 51-54). The navigation data which is displayed includes only alphanumeric text information relating to a selected destination such as latitude and longitude coordinates. (Col. 6, Ins. 24-37).

The Kashiwazaki reference relates only to a navigation system and does not disclose selective access to data files. Kaszhiwazaki's system allows a user access to the entirety of the map and navigation data which may be displayed by segments of interest.

Wehrenberg relates to a copy protection system for an entire CD-ROM or DVD but does not relate to navigation systems nor a vehicle based system. Wehrenberg does not relate to protecting different files on a storage medium. The section cited by the Examiner does not relate to selectively protecting different files, but relates to encrypting different units of data i.e. a 64k block (p. 3, Ins. 14-16) which make up a bigger file. Thus the method in Wehrenberg only

results in a complex key which splits all the data on a stored file into different units of data each of which has its own code which all are combined in an overall key. Wehrenberg does not disclose such a method could be used for different entire data files since the method only relates to discrete blocks which make up a file but by themselves are meaningless.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Brunts and has rejected claim 1 as obvious over Cooper in view of Kashiwazaki.

In order to further distinguish the present invention from Brunts, Cooper and Kashiwazaki, Applicant has amended claim 1 to require that a file may be individually checked via the identifier from a group of files. Amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Brunts because it now requires that an individual file or files from a group of files is accessible. Brunts only discloses a security key which allows access relating to the contents of an entire storage medium. Once the proper identification is obtained in Brunts, the entirety of the data files on the data card is accessible to the user. No selection of an individual file or group of files is possible. The combination of Cooper and Kashiwazaki also does not anticipate amended claim 1 because amended claim 1 now requires that the storage medium also has its own authorization. As noted above, Kashiwazaki does not contemplate any security. Combining Kashiwazaki with Cooper would not anticipate amended claim 1 because Cooper's encryption scheme is specific to a file and does not relate to a selected group of files. Such a combination would require multiple keys if a user desired access to a group of files and thus would not anticipate amended claim 1 which now requires a single key for each file of a group of files. Amended claim 1 is thus allowable over these references. Claims 2-23 depend from claim 1 and are similarly allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 as being anticipated by Cooper. Applicant has amended claim 24 to require that a group of selected files are enabled to be accessible with a single identifier and key. Cooper does not anticipate amended claim 24 because Cooper generates a

unique key for each file on a storage medium rather than a single key for multiple selected files.


Claims 25-38 depend from claim 24 and are similarly allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 39 as anticipated by Wehrenberg. Applicant has amended claim 39 to further distinguish over Wehrenberg. Amended claim 39 now requires that the key and identifier for access to a group of data files is stored. Wehrenberg does not anticipate amended claim 39 because Wehrenberg does not have a singular key for a group of data files. Wehrenberg concerns a single identification key for multiple blocks of data for a single data file and not for a group of data files as now required by claim 39. Applicant respectfully submits amended claim 39 is now allowable. Claims 40-45 depend from claim 39 and are similarly allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims (1-45) are in condition for allowance and that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance in the above-identified application. The Office is authorized to charge all fees, if any, associated with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-0019.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2005

  
Wayne L. Tang, Reg. No. 36,028

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP  
P.O. Box 2828  
Chicago, IL 60690-2828  
(312) 782-0600  
Customer Number 26565  
1265756